

Camp	Hayworth	Paxon
Canady	Hefley	Petri
Castle	Heinemann	Pombo
Chabot	Herger	Porter
Chambliss	Hilleary	Portman
Chenoweth	Hobson	Pryce
Christensen	Hoekstra	Quillen
Chrysler	Hoke	Quinn
Clinger	Horn	Radanovich
Coble	Hostettler	Ramstad
Coburn	Houghton	Regula
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Riggs
Combest	Hutchinson	Roberts
Cooley	Hyde	Rogers
Cox	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Crane	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Crapo	Johnson (CT)	Roth
Cremeans	Johnson, Sam	Roukema
Cubin	Jones	Royce
Cunningham	Kasich	Salmon
Davis	Kelly	Sanford
Deal	Kim	Saxton
DeLay	King	Scarborough
Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Schaefer
Doolittle	Klug	Schiff
Dornan	Knollenberg	Seastrand
Dreier	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
Duncan	LaHood	Shadegg
Dunn	Largent	Shaw
Ehlers	Latham	Shays
Ehrlich	LaTourette	Shuster
Emerson	Laughlin	Skeen
English	Lazio	Smith (MI)
Ensign	Leach	Smith (TX)
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Smith (WA)
Ewing	Lewis (KY)	Solomon
Fawell	Lightfoot	Souder
Fields (TX)	Linder	Spence
Flanagan	Livingston	Stearns
Foley	LoBiondo	Stockman
Forbes	Longley	Stump
Fowler	Lucas	Talent
Fox	Manzullo	Tate
Franks (CT)	Martini	Taylor (NC)
Franks (NJ)	McCollum	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Thornberry
Frisa	McDade	Tiahrt
Funderburk	McHugh	Torkildsen
Gallegly	McIntosh	Traficant
Ganske	McKeon	Upton
Gekas	Metcalf	Vucanovich
Gilchrest	Meyers	Waldholtz
Gillmor	Mica	Walker
Gilman	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Goodlatte	Molinari	Wamp
Goodling	Moorhead	Watts (OK)
Gordon	Morella	Weldon (FL)
Goss	Myers	Weldon (PA)
Graham	Myrick	Weller
Greenwood	Nethercutt	White
Gunderson	Neumann	Whitfield
Gutknecht	Ney	Wicker
Hancock	Norwood	Wolf
Hansen	Nussle	Young (AK)
Hastert	Oxley	Young (FL)
Hastings (WA)	Packard	Zeliff
Hayes	Parker	Zimmer

## NAYS—188

Abercrombie	Conyers	Frost
Ackerman	Costello	Furse
Andrews	Coyne	Gejdenson
Baesler	Cramer	Gephardt
Baldacci	Danner	Geren
Barcia	de la Garza	Gibbons
Barrett (WI)	DeFazio	Gonzalez
Becerra	DeLauro	Green
Beilenson	Dellums	Gutierrez
Bentsen	Deutsch	Hall (OH)
Berman	Dicks	Hall (TX)
Bevill	Dingell	Hamilton
Bishop	Dixon	Harman
Bonior	Doggett	Hastings (FL)
Borski	Dooley	Hefner
Boucher	Doyle	Hilliard
Browder	Durbin	Hinchey
Brown (CA)	Edwards	Holden
Brown (FL)	Engel	Hoyer
Bryant (TX)	Eshoo	Jackson-Lee
Cardin	Evans	Jacobs
Chapman	Farr	Jefferson
Clay	Fattah	Johnson (SD)
Clayton	Fazio	Johnson, E. B.
Clement	Fields (LA)	Johnston
Clyburn	Filner	Kanjorski
Coleman	Flake	Kaptur
Collins (IL)	Foglietta	Kennedy (MA)
Collins (MI)	Ford	Kennedy (RI)
Condit	Frank (MA)	Kennelly

Kildee	Nadler	Serrano
Klecza	Neal	Skaggs
Klink	Oberstar	Skelton
LaFalce	Obey	Slaughter
Lantos	Olver	Spratt
Levin	Ortiz	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Orton	Stenholm
Lincoln	Owens	Stokes
Lipinski	Pallone	Studds
Lofgren	Pastor	Stupak
Lowe	Payne (NJ)	Tanner
Luther	Payne (VA)	Taylor (MS)
Maloney	Pelosi	Tejeda
Manton	Peterson (FL)	Thompson
Markey	Peterson (MN)	Thornton
Martinez	Pickett	Thurman
Mascara	Pomeroy	Torres
Matsui	Poshard	Torricelli
McCarthy	Rahall	Towns
McDermott	Rangel	Vento
McHale	Reed	Visclosky
McKinney	Richardson	Volkmmer
McNulty	Rivers	Ward
Meahan	Roemer	Waters
Meek	Rose	Watt (NC)
Miller (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Minge	Rush	Williams
Mink	Sabo	Wise
Moakley	Sanders	Woolsey
Mollohan	Sawyer	Wyden
Montgomery	Schroeder	Wynn
Moran	Schumer	Yates
Murtha	Scott	

## NOT VOTING—13

Brewster	Menendez	Tucker
Brown (OH)	Mfume	Velazquez
Buyer	Sisisky	Wilson
Dickey	Smith (NJ)	
McInnis	Tauzin	

□ 1413

Mr. ORTIZ changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1745, UTAH PUBLIC LANDS MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1995

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-404) on the resolution (H. Res. 303) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1745) to designate certain public lands in the State of Utah as wilderness, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1415

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 301, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 301, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 12, 1995 at page H14288.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, this is the conference report on Interior. As my colleagues know, it was recommitment once on the question of the moratorium on mining, and the second time on the mining issue and also on the Tongass timber program.

Mr. Speaker, the questions on mining and the Tongass, I will address, but let me say at the outset I think what we have is a very fair bill. For example, we had dozens and dozens of requests from Members for various things that might impact in their districts, and the number on the Democratic side that we responded to is actually a few more than on the Republican side. We made an effort to respond on the merits of the issues without regard to partisanship, and I would hope that my colleagues on the minority side would support this legislation. I think likewise that the majority Members should do the same, and I think, as I explain what we made in the way of changes, that my colleagues will understand we have responded to the concerns of the Members.

Also I think it is very important that we get this bill down to the President, and I would hope he would sign it. There are 130,000 employees who are waiting and hoping that this legislation will become law so they can get on with the job of managing the parks, keeping the gates open for the public to enjoy these wonderful facilities; likewise in managing our forests, our public lands, the grazing lands, the fish and wildlife facilities, the Smithsonian, the National Gallery. Many of my colleagues probably had their visitors here experience the fact that the doors were closed on the Smithsonian, the National Gallery, the Kennedy Center during the period of time, the 5 days or so, that we did not have funding, and, if we can get this conference report passed in the House and the Senate, get it to the President, I think to examine the merits of the bill, that the executive branch, the President, will recognize that we have been as fair as possible, that we have addressed the problems.

I want to say also at the outset that there is some talk about a budget bust. That has got to be the new math in this town, because this bill is \$1.3 billion under 1995 in budget authority. It

is about 10 percent below 1995, and it causes some tough decisions, but if we are to get to a balanced budget in 7 years, we have to look at each expenditure and say can we do this more efficiently, and we have tried to apply the policies of total quality management to the responsibilities that we have.

Let me address the issues that caused the recommitment, the first being the Tongass, the rain forest in the State of Alaska. A statement was made during the debate on the rule that actually we were increasing the cut. Exactly the opposite is happening. In the modified language, which I might say was worked over and agreed to by both sides of this issue on the Tongass, we reduced the allowable cut from 450 million board feet to 418 million board feet in the Tongass, so this is a reduction of the amount that can be allowed as far as cutting the timber. The practical matter is that the money in the bill, because of reduced funding, is only enough to allow for about 310 million board feet, and the same will likely be true in the 1997 bill. So, as far as the amount of cut that is allowed, it is substantially below what had been allowed prior to this time, so I think that is one of the ways we responded to those who have a concern for the Tongass.

Second, we removed the sufficiency language. Sufficiency language insulates actions from the courts from the requirements for environmental evaluation, and in the original bill that was language that was placed in there by the other body. We remove that so that the cuts in the Tongass, with one exception, are subject to all the rules, regulations, the actions of the courts, the Environmental Protection Agency, the endangered species law, the whole 9 yards, and therefore I think for those who are concerned about the environmental impacts, Mr. Speaker, we have made every effort to insure that environmental concerns are addressed. The one sale has already gone through all this, and we would allow that sale to be transferred to another buyer.

We have also allowed the planning process by the Forest Service to continue. They can go forward in their planning process to determine what should be the allowable cut and how it

should be handled in the future, and that plan, we would hope, would be developed in the next several months. We give the Department a totally free hand in the planning process.

We removed the language concerning the Goshawk and permanently prohibiting establishing certain habitat conservable areas. The administration strongly objected to this permanent provision and it has been deleted.

I think on balance what we have done in the Tongass represents a very good compromise between those who are concerned about providing the jobs in Alaska, allowing a cut, and those who want to protect the environment, protect this forest, and as I said earlier, this represents a compromise among the interested parties.

On the mining issue, which was also part of the motion to recommit, we removed the triggers that would lift the moratorium so what we have is a moratorium with no triggers. We also provide that the Department of Interior, or BLM, has a 5-year period to process the grandfathered patents, and I know that is of an interest to those who have concern about the mining proposals. But, the moratorium that has been in place in the 1995 bill remains in place in the 1996 bill, and I think this is the important fact that I want to convey to all members:

We responded to the motion to recommit exactly as has been requested in that motion. It also provides that the Secretary of Interior should give us a report in the year as to what success they are having in getting the grandfather patents in which people have a proprietary interest effectuated or out to the applicants.

On the question of the Indians, I know the gentleman from Wisconsin, the minority leader on the Committee on Appropriations, was concerned about adequate funding for the Indians, and we had a request from the administration. Actually they requested \$110 million over the Senate level. We end up here with \$11 million. We have added \$50 million from the second conference report to this one, \$25 for tribal priorities. This allows the Indian tribes to use these funds in the way that will best serve their individual tribes and

the people that are members thereof, and we put \$25 million in Indian health, recognizing again that this is extremely important as we discharge our responsibility. One of the treaty obligations, the really true major obligations we have under the treaties, one is to provide health services, and the second is to provide education, and we have addressed those, and we have added the \$50 million.

We have some other changes in the conference report. They are not big items, and I would be happy to address those in response to any questions. One of these would be requested by the Department of Interior, to allow them to work out agreements in cooperation with other levels of government. Also, a requirement that limits the log exports for an additional period of time in the Western States, and most of the other changes were agreed on, but I think the important thing I want to impress on the Members is that we responded to the motion to recommit. On the Tongass, on the mining moratorium, we responded in a way in which I think those who are interested parties will tell the Members during this debate that they are very well pleased with what we have been able to do, and the bill itself, I believe, responds, given the fiscal constraints we had, very effectively in meeting the needs of the people.

So I would hope that we can get this passed and get on with it. Our responsibilities, and we can say to those 130,000 employees, "We know your job is important, we know the public depends on you to provide the services in the parks, the forests and so on, and we want to let you know that we are behind you by supporting this legislation."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD include a table on the various accounts in the bill, as agreed to by the conference managers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The table on the various accounts in the bill is as follows:

## FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>						
<b>Bureau of Land Management</b>						
Management of lands and resources .....	597,236,000	616,547,000	570,017,000	563,936,000	566,062,000	-29,174,000
Fire protection .....	114,748,000	114,763,000				-114,748,000
Emergency Department of the Interior firefighting fund .....	121,176,000	131,482,000				-121,176,000
Wildland fire management .....			235,924,000	240,159,000	235,924,000	+235,924,000
Central hazmat account .....	13,409,000	14,024,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-3,409,000
Construction and access .....	12,088,000	3,019,000	2,515,000	2,615,000	3,115,000	-8,963,000
Payments in lieu of taxes .....	101,409,000	113,911,000	111,409,000	100,000,000	101,500,000	+91,000
Land acquisition .....	14,757,000	24,473,000	8,500,000	10,550,000	12,800,000	-1,657,000
Oregon and California grant lands .....	97,364,000	112,752,000	91,387,000	95,364,000	93,379,000	-3,985,000
Range improvements (indefinite) .....	10,350,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	-1,237,000
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures (indefinite) .....	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	+110,000
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite) .....	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	
<b>Total, Bureau of Land Management .....</b>	<b>1,099,005,000</b>	<b>1,156,682,000</b>	<b>1,055,463,000</b>	<b>1,048,335,000</b>	<b>1,060,491,000</b>	<b>-48,514,000</b>
<b>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</b>						
Resource management .....	511,334,000	535,018,000	497,150,000	501,478,000	497,943,000	-13,391,000
Construction .....	53,788,000	34,085,000	28,355,000	38,775,000	37,855,000	-16,113,000
Natural resource damage assessment and restoration fund .....	6,667,000	6,700,000	6,018,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-2,667,000
Land acquisition .....	67,141,000	62,912,000	14,100,000	32,031,000	36,900,000	-30,241,000
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund .....	8,963,000	36,000,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	-896,000
National wildlife refuge fund .....	11,977,000	11,371,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	-1,198,000
Rewards and operations .....	1,167,000	1,166,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	-567,000
North American wetlands conservation fund .....	8,963,000	12,000,000	4,500,000	6,750,000	6,750,000	-2,233,000
Lahontan Valley and Pyramid Lake fish and wildlife fund .....		152,000	152,000	152,000	152,000	+152,000
Rhinoceros and tiger conservation fund .....		400,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	+200,000
Wildlife conservation and appreciation fund .....	998,000	1,000,000	998,000	800,000	800,000	-198,000
<b>Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service .....</b>	<b>671,038,000</b>	<b>702,817,000</b>	<b>568,838,000</b>	<b>603,850,000</b>	<b>603,864,000</b>	<b>-67,174,000</b>
<b>Natural Resources Science Agency</b>						
Research, inventories, and surveys .....	162,041,000	172,696,000		145,965,000		-162,041,000
<b>National Park Service</b>						
Operation of the national park system .....	1,077,900,000	1,157,738,000	1,088,248,000	1,082,265,000	1,083,151,000	+5,251,000
National recreation and preservation .....	42,941,000	39,305,000	35,725,000	38,084,000	37,849,000	-5,292,000
Historic preservation fund .....	41,421,000	43,000,000	37,934,000	38,312,000	38,212,000	-5,209,000
Construction .....	167,888,000	179,883,000	114,868,000	116,480,000	143,225,000	-24,463,000
Urban park and recreation fund .....	8,000	2,300,000				-8,000
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority) .....	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	
Land acquisition and state assistance .....	87,373,000	82,666,000	14,300,000	45,187,000	49,100,000	-38,273,000
Crime Trust Fund .....		15,200,000				
<b>Total, National Park Service (net) .....</b>	<b>1,387,329,000</b>	<b>1,480,122,000</b>	<b>1,261,078,000</b>	<b>1,300,338,000</b>	<b>1,319,337,000</b>	<b>-67,992,000</b>
<b>United States Geological Survey</b>						
Surveys, investigations, and research .....	571,462,000	586,369,000	686,944,000	577,503,000	730,503,000	+159,041,000
<b>Minerals Management Service</b>						
Royalty and offshore minerals management .....	188,181,000	193,348,000	186,556,000	182,189,000	182,994,000	-5,187,000
Oil spill research .....	8,440,000	7,892,000	8,440,000	8,440,000	8,440,000	
<b>Total, Minerals Management Service .....</b>	<b>194,621,000</b>	<b>201,240,000</b>	<b>192,996,000</b>	<b>188,609,000</b>	<b>189,434,000</b>	<b>-5,187,000</b>
<b>Bureau of Mines</b>						
Mines and minerals .....	152,427,000	132,507,000	87,000,000	128,007,000	84,000,000	-88,427,000
<b>Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement</b>						
Regulation and technology .....	109,795,000	107,162,000	92,751,000	95,470,000	95,470,000	-14,325,000
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite) .....	1,189,000	501,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-689,000
<b>Subtotal .....</b>	<b>110,984,000</b>	<b>107,663,000</b>	<b>93,251,000</b>	<b>95,970,000</b>	<b>95,970,000</b>	<b>-15,014,000</b>
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund) .....	182,423,000	185,120,000	176,327,000	170,441,000	173,887,000	-8,536,000
<b>Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement .....</b>	<b>293,407,000</b>	<b>292,773,000</b>	<b>269,578,000</b>	<b>266,411,000</b>	<b>269,857,000</b>	<b>-23,550,000</b>

## FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>						
Operation of Indian programs.....	1,519,012,000	1,609,842,000	1,509,828,000	1,261,234,000	1,384,434,000	-134,578,000
Construction.....	120,450,000	125,424,000	98,033,000	107,333,000	100,833,000	-19,617,000
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians.....	77,096,000	151,025,000	75,145,000	82,745,000	80,845,000	+3,549,000
Navajo rehabilitation trust fund.....	1,996,000					-1,996,000
Technical assistance of Indian enterprises.....	1,996,000	1,996,000		900,000	500,000	-1,496,000
Indian direct loan program account.....	779,000					-779,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(10,890,000)					(-10,890,000)
Indian guaranteed loan program account.....	9,671,000	9,684,000		7,700,000	5,000,000	-4,671,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)		(50,880,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
<b>Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....</b>	<b>1,730,970,000</b>	<b>1,897,941,000</b>	<b>1,682,806,000</b>	<b>1,459,912,000</b>	<b>1,571,412,000</b>	<b>-159,558,000</b>
<b>Territorial and International Affairs</b>						
Assistance to territories.....	50,481,000	41,512,000	24,885,000	40,468,000	37,468,000	-13,013,000
Northern Mariana Islands Covenant.....	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>78,201,000</b>	<b>69,232,000</b>	<b>52,405,000</b>	<b>68,188,000</b>	<b>65,188,000</b>	<b>-13,013,000</b>
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	19,800,000					-19,800,000
Compact of Free Association.....	13,574,000	10,036,000	14,618,000	10,036,000	10,036,000	-3,536,000
Mandatory payments.....	10,000,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	+4,900,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>23,574,000</b>	<b>24,936,000</b>	<b>29,518,000</b>	<b>24,936,000</b>	<b>24,936,000</b>	<b>+1,364,000</b>
<b>Total, Territorial and International Affairs.....</b>	<b>121,575,000</b>	<b>94,170,000</b>	<b>81,923,000</b>	<b>93,126,000</b>	<b>90,126,000</b>	<b>-31,449,000</b>
<b>Departmental Offices</b>						
Departmental management.....	62,476,000	64,772,000	53,919,000	57,796,000	57,796,000	-4,683,000
Office of the Solicitor.....	34,806,000	35,361,000	34,806,000	34,806,000	34,806,000	
Office of Inspector General.....	23,939,000	23,485,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	
Construction Management.....	1,996,000	2,000,000		500,000		-1,496,000
National Indian Gaming Commission.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.....				16,336,000	16,336,000	+16,336,000
<b>Total, Departmental Offices.....</b>	<b>124,022,000</b>	<b>126,618,000</b>	<b>113,465,000</b>	<b>134,181,000</b>	<b>134,181,000</b>	<b>+10,159,000</b>
<b>Total, title I, Department of the Interior:</b>						
New budget (obligational) authority (net).....	6,507,897,000	6,855,935,000	6,000,190,000	5,946,037,000	6,023,205,000	-484,892,000
Appropriations.....	(6,537,897,000)	(6,870,735,000)	(6,030,190,000)	(5,976,037,000)	(6,053,205,000)	(-484,892,000)
Reversion.....	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	
Crime trust fund.....		(15,200,000)				
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(10,890,000)					(-10,890,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)		(50,880,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
<b>TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</b>						
<b>Forest Service</b>						
Forest research.....	193,748,000	203,796,000	182,000,000	177,000,000	178,000,000	-15,748,000
State and private forestry.....	154,288,000	187,459,000	129,551,000	136,794,000	136,794,000	-17,474,000
Emergency pest suppression fund.....	17,000,000					-17,000,000
International forestry.....	4,967,000	10,000,000				-4,967,000
National forest system.....	1,328,893,000	1,348,755,000	1,288,688,000	1,247,543,000	1,256,253,000	-72,840,000
Forest Service fire protection.....	159,285,000	164,285,000				-159,285,000
Emergency Forest Service firefighting fund.....	228,200,000	239,000,000				-228,200,000
Emergency appropriations.....	450,000,000					-450,000,000
Wildland Fire Management.....			385,485,000	381,485,000	385,485,000	+385,485,000
Construction.....	199,215,000	182,338,000	120,000,000	186,888,000	183,500,000	-35,715,000
Timber receipts transfer to general fund (indefinite).....	(-44,798,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
Timber purchaser credits.....	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
Land acquisition.....	63,882,000	65,311,000	14,600,000	41,187,000	41,200,000	-22,682,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts.....	1,250,000	1,317,000	1,089,000	1,089,000	1,089,000	-181,000
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite).....	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	
Range betterment fund (indefinite).....	4,576,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	-599,000
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research.....	99,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	+3,000
<b>Total, Forest Service.....</b>	<b>2,803,802,000</b>	<b>2,416,539,000</b>	<b>2,103,671,000</b>	<b>2,176,224,000</b>	<b>2,186,579,000</b>	<b>-637,023,000</b>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY</b>						
Clean coal technology.....	-337,879,000	-155,019,000				+337,879,000
Fossil energy research and development.....	423,701,000	436,506,000	379,524,000	376,181,000	417,199,000	-6,532,000
(By transfer).....	(17,000,000)					(-17,000,000)
Alternative fuels production (indefinite).....	-3,900,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	+1,500,000
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.....	187,048,000	101,026,000	151,026,000	136,026,000	148,786,000	-38,262,000
Energy conservation.....	756,751,000	923,561,000	556,371,000	576,976,000	553,293,000	-202,486,000
Biomass Energy Development (transfer).....		-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000

## FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Economic regulation.....	12,413,000	10,500,000	6,297,000	8,038,000	6,297,000	-6,116,000
Emergency preparedness.....	8,233,000	8,219,000				-8,233,000
Strategic Petroleum Reserve.....	135,954,000	25,699,000				-135,954,000
(By transfer).....	(90,784,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+98,236,000)
Energy Information Administration.....	84,586,000	84,689,000	79,798,000	84,766,000	72,299,000	-12,300,000
<b>Total, Department of Energy.....</b>	<b>1,265,667,000</b>	<b>1,416,775,000</b>	<b>1,154,586,000</b>	<b>1,143,589,000</b>	<b>1,179,411,000</b>	<b>-99,476,000</b>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</b>						
<b>Indian Health Service</b>						
Indian health services.....	1,709,780,000	1,816,350,000	1,725,762,000	1,815,373,000	1,747,842,000	+38,062,000
Indian health facilities.....	253,282,000	242,672,000	236,675,000	151,227,000	238,958,000	-14,324,000
<b>Total, Indian Health Service.....</b>	<b>1,963,062,000</b>	<b>2,059,022,000</b>	<b>1,962,787,000</b>	<b>1,966,600,000</b>	<b>1,986,800,000</b>	<b>+23,736,000</b>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION</b>						
<b>Office of Elementary and Secondary Education</b>						
Indian education.....	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	54,660,000	52,500,000	-28,841,000
<b>OTHER RELATED AGENCIES</b>						
<b>Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	24,686,000	26,345,000	21,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	-4,543,000
<b>Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development</b>						
Payment to the Institute.....	11,213,000	19,846,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
<b>Smithsonian Institution</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	313,653,000	329,800,000	306,471,000	307,968,000	306,188,000	-5,665,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	3,042,000	4,960,000	3,000,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	+208,000
Repair and restoration of buildings.....	23,954,000	34,000,000	24,954,000	33,954,000	33,954,000	+10,000,000
Construction.....	21,857,000	36,700,000	12,860,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	+5,843,000
<b>Total, Smithsonian Institution.....</b>	<b>362,706,000</b>	<b>407,460,000</b>	<b>350,375,000</b>	<b>372,882,000</b>	<b>373,092,000</b>	<b>+10,386,000</b>
<b>National Gallery of Art</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	52,902,000	54,568,000	51,315,000	51,844,000	51,844,000	-1,056,000
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings.....	4,016,000	9,865,000	5,500,000	7,365,000	6,442,000	+2,426,000
<b>Total, National Gallery of Art.....</b>	<b>56,918,000</b>	<b>64,451,000</b>	<b>56,815,000</b>	<b>59,229,000</b>	<b>58,286,000</b>	<b>+1,366,000</b>
<b>John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts</b>						
Operations and maintenance.....	10,323,000	10,373,000	9,800,000	10,323,000	10,323,000	
Construction.....	8,963,000	9,000,000	8,963,000	8,963,000	8,963,000	
<b>Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....</b>	<b>19,306,000</b>	<b>19,373,000</b>	<b>18,763,000</b>	<b>19,306,000</b>	<b>19,306,000</b>	
<b>Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	8,676,000	10,070,000	5,140,000	6,537,000	5,840,000	-3,036,000
<b>National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities</b>						
<b>National Endowment for the Arts</b>						
Grants and administration.....	133,846,000	143,675,000	82,256,000	88,785,000	82,256,000	-51,587,000
Matching grants.....	26,512,000	26,725,000	17,235,000	21,235,000	17,235,000	-11,277,000
<b>Total, National Endowment for the Arts.....</b>	<b>162,358,000</b>	<b>172,400,000</b>	<b>99,494,000</b>	<b>110,000,000</b>	<b>99,494,000</b>	<b>-62,884,000</b>
<b>National Endowment for the Humanities</b>						
Grants and administration.....	146,131,000	156,067,000	82,469,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	-52,131,000
Matching grants.....	25,913,000	25,913,000	17,025,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	-9,913,000
<b>Total, National Endowment for the Humanities.....</b>	<b>172,044,000</b>	<b>182,000,000</b>	<b>99,494,000</b>	<b>110,000,000</b>	<b>110,000,000</b>	<b>-62,044,000</b>
<b>Institute of Museum Services</b>						
Grants and administration.....	26,715,000	29,800,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
<b>Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities..</b>	<b>363,117,000</b>	<b>384,200,000</b>	<b>219,988,000</b>	<b>241,000,000</b>	<b>230,494,000</b>	<b>-132,623,000</b>
<b>Commission of Fine Arts</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	834,000	879,000	834,000	834,000	834,000	
<b>National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs</b>						
Grants.....	7,500,000	6,941,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,500,000
<b>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	2,947,000	3,063,000	3,063,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000

**FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>National Capital Planning Commission</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	5,655,000	6,000,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	-565,000
<b>Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	46,000	147,000	46,000	147,000	147,000	+99,000
<b>Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	2,738,000	3,043,000	2,000,000	.....	.....	-2,738,000
Public development .....	4,084,000	2,445,000	.....	.....	.....	-4,084,000
Land acquisition and development fund .....	.....	1,368,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Total, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation .....</b>	<b>6,822,000</b>	<b>6,876,000</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>-6,822,000</b>
<b>United States Holocaust Memorial Council</b>						
Holocaust Memorial Council .....	26,609,000	26,707,000	26,707,000	26,609,000	26,707,000	+2,098,000
<b>Total, title II, Related Agencies .....</b>	<b>7,011,333,000</b>	<b>6,961,469,000</b>	<b>5,997,212,000</b>	<b>6,107,082,000</b>	<b>6,141,431,000</b>	<b>-869,902,000</b>
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite) .....	(-44,799,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits) .....	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	.....
<b>TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION</b>						
General reduction, Energy conservation .....	.....	.....	-12,799,000	.....	.....	.....
<b>Grand total:</b>						
New budget (obligational) authority (net) .....	13,519,230,000	13,817,404,000	11,984,603,000	12,053,099,000	12,164,636,000	-1,354,594,000
Appropriations .....	(13,549,230,000)	(13,832,204,000)	(12,027,402,000)	(12,063,099,000)	(12,194,636,000)	(-1,354,594,000)
Rescission .....	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	.....
Crime trust fund .....	.....	(15,200,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite) .....	(-44,799,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits) .....	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	.....
(By transfer) .....	(107,784,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+79,236,000)
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>						
Bureau of Land Management .....	1,099,005,000	1,156,682,000	1,056,463,000	1,048,335,000	1,050,491,000	-48,514,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service .....	671,036,000	702,817,000	596,936,000	603,650,000	603,864,000	-67,174,000
National Biological Service .....	162,041,000	172,666,000	.....	145,965,000	.....	-162,041,000
National Park Service .....	1,367,329,000	1,460,122,000	1,261,076,000	1,300,336,000	1,319,337,000	-67,992,000
United States Geological Survey .....	571,462,000	586,969,000	696,944,000	577,503,000	730,503,000	+159,041,000
Minerals Management Service .....	194,621,000	201,240,000	192,996,000	186,606,000	189,434,000	-5,187,000
Bureau of Mines .....	152,427,000	132,507,000	87,000,000	126,007,000	64,000,000	-66,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement .....	293,407,000	292,773,000	269,578,000	266,411,000	269,657,000	-23,550,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs .....	1,730,970,000	1,697,941,000	1,682,808,000	1,459,912,000	1,571,412,000	-159,556,000
Territorial and International Affairs .....	121,575,000	94,170,000	81,923,000	93,126,000	90,126,000	-31,446,000
Departmental Offices .....	124,022,000	126,618,000	113,496,000	134,181,000	134,181,000	+10,166,000
<b>Total, Title I - Department of the Interior .....</b>	<b>6,507,897,000</b>	<b>6,855,935,000</b>	<b>6,000,190,000</b>	<b>5,948,037,000</b>	<b>6,023,205,000</b>	<b>-484,692,000</b>
<b>TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES</b>						
Forest Service .....	2,603,602,000	2,416,539,000	2,103,671,000	2,176,224,000	2,166,579,000	-637,023,000
Department of Energy .....	1,265,887,000	1,416,776,000	1,154,598,000	1,143,589,000	1,179,411,000	-86,476,000
Indian Health Service .....	1,983,082,000	2,059,022,000	1,962,767,000	1,966,600,000	1,966,600,000	+23,738,000
Indian Education .....	61,341,000	84,765,000	52,500,000	54,860,000	52,500,000	-26,841,000
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation .....	24,888,000	26,345,000	21,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	-4,543,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development .....	11,213,000	19,846,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution .....	362,706,000	407,460,000	360,375,000	372,692,000	373,082,000	+10,366,000
National Gallery of Art .....	56,916,000	64,461,000	56,815,000	56,229,000	56,298,000	+1,366,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts .....	19,306,000	19,373,000	18,763,000	19,306,000	19,306,000	.....
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars .....	6,678,000	10,070,000	5,140,000	6,537,000	5,840,000	-3,036,000
National Endowment for the Arts .....	162,368,000	172,400,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	99,494,000	-62,864,000
National Endowment for the Humanities .....	172,044,000	182,000,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	-62,044,000
Institute of Museum Services .....	26,715,000	29,600,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
Commission of Fine Arts .....	834,000	879,000	834,000	834,000	834,000	.....
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs .....	7,500,000	6,941,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation .....	2,947,000	3,063,000	3,063,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000
National Capital Planning Commission .....	5,655,000	6,000,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	-565,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission .....	46,000	147,000	46,000	147,000	147,000	+99,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation .....	6,822,000	6,876,000	2,000,000	.....	.....	-6,822,000
Holocaust Memorial Council .....	26,609,000	26,707,000	26,707,000	26,609,000	26,707,000	+2,098,000
<b>Total, Title II - Related Agencies .....</b>	<b>7,011,333,000</b>	<b>6,961,469,000</b>	<b>5,997,212,000</b>	<b>6,107,082,000</b>	<b>6,141,431,000</b>	<b>-869,902,000</b>
<b>TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION</b>						
General reduction, Energy conservation .....	.....	.....	-12,799,000	.....	.....	.....
<b>Grand total .....</b>	<b>13,519,230,000</b>	<b>13,817,404,000</b>	<b>11,984,603,000</b>	<b>12,053,099,000</b>	<b>12,164,636,000</b>	<b>-1,354,594,000</b>

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], has done as good a job as one can do with the assets that were at hand, a reasonable job, but it still is a very, very bad bill, and I intend to vote against it. He said that the conferees had responded to the motions of the House by making appropriate changes to Tongass and mining. The mining change does restore the moratorium, but the change to Tongass is so small as to be infinitesimal, and it still will be environmentally unsound.

Mr. Speaker, the song asks where have all the flowers gone, and the poem asks where are the snows of yesteryear. I ask where are all the Republican moderates going? Will the Republicans reject a bill that is as environmentally disgraceful as the previous bill? It appears that the Republican leadership has pressured their moderate members to swallow hard and support this bill, and that is too bad because this bill is not worthy of their support, nor is it worthy of the support of any of us in the House.

□ 1430

The conference report before us still puts our precious natural resources at grave risk. This conference report mandates the Forest Service implement the discredited alternative P management plan in the Tongass National Forest in Alaska, and this bad plan is not forced upon the Forest Service for 1 year, but it mandates alternative P be employed as well in fiscal year 1997.

I think most Members now know that alternative P is a radical forest management plan that was rejected by the Forest Service and rejected by the Governor of Alaska because it would wreak ecological havoc on the Tongass. Currently the Forest Service allows 310 million board feet of timber to be cut from the Tongass each year. Alternative P does not recognize that limitation, although my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, indicated that the funds that are made available for the cut in this year will only allow a cut of 310 million board feet. Nevertheless, the spurs will be put to the Forest Service, the whip will be lashed upon its employees to exceed the 310 million board feet, because alternative P puts that pressure upon them.

In addition, the Tongass provisions are fiscally irresponsible. The Tongass is a notorious below-cost forest. In the last 3 years the Government lost \$102 million in timber sales there. If the timber harvest increases, the loss to the taxpayers increases. It will go up dramatically. What is more, this conference report also contains sufficiency language concerning which my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, spoke. It is aimed at overturning the 9th Circuit Court ruling that blocks the sale of 280 million board feet of

timber. If this sufficiency language is approved, no environmental laws will be in effect for the large sale, the large sale for which the sufficiency language is placed in the bill.

That means, Mr. Speaker, the Endangered Species Act is dismissed, the National Environmental Policy Act is waived, the Clean Water Act is ignored, and all other applicable laws are considered irrelevant. In addition, this sufficiency language prevents all citizens, environmentalists and private landowners alike, from exercising their right for a fair hearing before the courts.

If we do not recommit this conference report, we will be rejecting the judgment of the Forest Service. We will be putting a great forest at risk, and we will be setting a dangerous legal precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer a motion to recommit at the appropriate time, and I hope that motion may be sustained, with the help of the moderate Republicans, again.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a member of the subcommittee.

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Interior appropriations conference report. This \$12.1 billion appropriations bill is the result of a lot of hard work, and yes, a lot of compromise. As we know, this bill has been recommitted twice because of concerns that have been expressed regarding two of the provisions that have already been mentioned here today, the mining patent moratorium and statutory language regarding the Tongass National Forest. But those two issues have been resolved after a lot of tough negotiations. Now it is time we pass this important legislation and send it to the President.

Putting together a workable budget for the Department of the Interior, the Department of Energy, the Forest Service, and numerous other independent agencies under this subcommittee's jurisdiction has not been an easy one. There have been a lot of roadblocks. Some of them have been legitimate, some of them frivolous. But here we are with a conference report that is fair, it is fiscally conservative, and I think it represents an excellent starting point for the 7-year journey toward a balanced budget that both the Congress and the President have now committed themselves to doing.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], chairman of the committee, has informed us of the various provisions that are in this bill. I just want to re-emphasize a couple of them. We have attempted to place an emphasis on preserving natural and cultural resources, the maintenance of scientific and research functions, our commitment to

the health and educational needs of Native Americans. The conference report also ensures that adequate resources are allocated for our Nation's public parks and, our crown jewels, our National Park System. In fact, in an era of decreasing budgets, this bill actually contains an increase in the operational account of the National Park Service. This is going to prove invaluable to the management of America's parks. Contrary to some published reports, the subcommittee never, never considered or even contemplated closing any of our Nation's parks.

I have spoken previously about some of the projects and programs in this report. A couple, though, deserve to be highlighted again. An important and much needed initiative is the recreational fee demonstration program. This innovative program will give the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Service, the opportunity to establish a 1-year pilot program that allows these land management agencies to charge and utilize onsite recreational use and access fees. The conference report directs each agency to establish up to 50 demonstration sites where broad fee authorities are established.

The best aspect of this program is that the bulk of the fees that are collected stay at the site which collects them. Allowing 80 percent of the fees that are collected to be used in that particular park is a way to give park managers an incentive to collect fees and make visitor driven improvements.

Another important aspect of this conference report is the level of funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Is it as much as the House initially provided? No. Compromises did have to be made. I think the level of funding proposed in this report is fair and it goes a long way to providing the necessary infrastructure services our tribal communities depend upon.

Under this bill, the BIA will receive \$1.3 billion in fiscal year 1996. This represents an additional \$25 million we added during the third conference for the tribal priority allocation program. It will now have \$653 million in fiscal year 1996. That is \$111 million above what the Senate had proposed. Conferees also added another \$25 million to the Indian Health Service Account, bringing their 1996 funding level to \$1.747 billion.

In addition to the preceding, the conference report contains a provision which is vitally important to the astrophysical community and certainly to the State of Arizona. This provision will allow the Mt. Graham Observatory project to continue construction of the world's largest ground-based telescope, the large binocular telescope. This legislative clarification was needed because of constant and often frivolous lawsuits that have beset the project, even though Congress spoke clearly on

this matter when it passed the Arizona-Idaho Wilderness Act in 1988, authorizing the construction of these three telescopes.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee, Senator GORTON, and all my colleagues on the conference committee for supporting this effort. Mr. Speaker, the conference report provides a sound and fiscally conservative blueprint for the continued management of our public lands. As stewards of these lands, it is incumbent upon us to ensure that they are preserved for future generations to enjoy. Let us stop the demagoguing and political posturing. It is a good bill, it is one that merits our support. Let us send it to the President. Support this conference report and let us defeat any motion to recommit.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, as we begin debate on this conference report, the third time we have had a conference report on this measure, I want to join my other colleagues in both paying my respect and expressing my affection toward our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], even as I express my dislike for his bill. I suspect that perhaps the chairman would rather have affection for his bill, rather than for him. But be that as it may, we are back again for the third time on this particular measure, and the Republican leadership's third try for an acceptable conference report on this important appropriations bill.

The first two times this bill was brought to the floor, the House did the right thing. We rejected the conference report and told the conferees to go back and try again. It was the right thing to do because neither of those conference reports deserved to pass.

This version is not quite so bad, but it still falls short, in my opinion, and I cannot support it. The Republican leadership would not let the conferees even try to improve many of the funding provisions in the previous conference report. While this version does provide somewhat more funding for native American programs, which I endorse heartily, the other provisions remain unchanged. The report still has all of the previous version's

antienvironmental riders, like the ban on any new listings under the Endangered Species Act.

The report does a much better job dealing with a moratorium on bargain basement sales of mineral lands. But as the ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois, has already pointed out, what about Tongass? The previous report called for increased timbering, including in areas that the Forest Service wants to put off limits in order to protect fish and wildlife, and would make permanent some of the temporary restrictions on protecting habitat that were misguidedly included in the rescissions bill earlier this year. This conference report with respect to Tongass is almost as bad, and on this point alone, if for no other reason, we should send it back so we may try again.

Regarding the National Endowment for the Arts, the conferees voted again to retain the so-called Helms language. That is a sad decision, and it should not be accepted.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this third conference report still is a bad bill, still deserves to be defeated. We should not pass it. If we do, the President should veto it and we should sustain that veto.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], chairman of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I would ask, where are the timber jobs of yesteryear? We asked where the flowers were and where the moderate Republicans are, but where are the timber jobs of yesteryear? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] had the privilege of serving at one time as the chairman, and knows full good and well, he voted for the Tongass agreement to allow us, in fact, to have a sound economy, yet leaving over 15 million acres in southeast Alaska out of the multiple-use timber base.

Good fiction never dies, especially fiction about the Tongass Forest that is being spread on this floor today. I can hardly believe my ears. Such a distinguished gentleman saying this would destroy the last standing rain forest of the great southeast Alaska, when there are 15 million acres already off limits to logging, and he has twice voted in this Congress to do so.

But we have lost 42 percent of our timber workers since the last act of this Congress on the Tongass in 1990.

This bill, as I suggested to the conference and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], is not everything I would want. In fact, this Tongass issue is truly a red herring. All we are asking in this agreement is to freeze a land base of 1.7 million acres, the amount of land agreed to in 1990 that would be available for timber over a 100-year period. The amendment says that the land base can no longer be taken away. And remember, we have 15 million acres of land available for wildlife and old growth habitat today. We are talking about a very small, tiny land base for timber.

Harvesting does not change, in fact, what can be harvested, does not increase at all under the provision. It does not tell the Forest Service what they can do, other than the fact it says "You can no longer take away any of that land base that we made available in two previous acts of Congress."

This, in fact, is further than I would have gone, but my senior Senator in fact has agreed to this. He sits on the conference. I am going to suggest, this conference report must pass.

I listened to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] yesterday saying "We can solve these problems if we just send the appropriation bills to the President." We are going to do that today. We will send him a bill that should be signed, a bill that does take care of the problem, a bill, in fact, that does keep a moratorium on mining, which the gentleman wishes to do. That is what he wanted.

This is good legislation, but I again would like to put to rest this constant misinformation, this constant fiction about the Tongass National Forest. We are talking about 1.7 million acres available for harvest but not cut, and we are talking about 15 million acres of rain forest unavailable for logging, 15 million acres for the future generations to study those great old trees and watch them become gray and fall down. We have already done that. Let us vote for this conference report. This is good legislation. Let us support the chairman.

□ 1445

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)



Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 1977, the Department of Interior appropriations for fiscal year 1996. As my colleagues all know, this is now the third time the House has considered this measure. Twice before, we sent it back to conferees and demanded that they place a moratorium on the sale of Federal lands for as little as \$2.50 an acre. Today, we have a third try at the Interior conference report which could stop this giveaway temporarily, but still contains some dangerous provisions.

When I look at the conference provisions to eliminate the Bureau of Mines, I am dismayed that Congress is rushing to dismantle the agency. As a child in Harlan County, KY, I was aware of mine disasters regularly occurring with great loss of life. Mining is considered the most dangerous of jobs. It took President Franklin Roosevelt to care enough about working people to intervene and impose worker safety standards.

Now, deciding that businesses know better, the 104th Congress has already crippled worker safety programs in the Labor Department. Under this legislation today, we will approve eliminating the Bureau of Mines, and accept a vague promise that health and safety research will be transferred to the Energy Department; itself slated to be demolished.

Another grave mistake in this conference report is the destruction of the NEA. When I see provisions to slash funding for the arts, I cannot understand the sense of this Congress to phase out an agency which costs about 64 cents a year per taxpayer and yields \$3.4 billion a year in tax revenue. I urge my colleagues to realize how much economic growth results from a modest investment in the arts.

Just last week, an article in the New York Times described the annual storytelling festival held in Jonesborough, TN, which drew crowds from all 50 States and generated over \$5 million in economic activity.

All across the country, cities and convention centers are forming partnerships with arts councils and museums, realizing the revenue possibilities with increased tourism.

In October, the White House Conference on Travel and Tourism devoted a day long session to cultural tourism, and the conference overwhelmingly agreed that arts and museum attractions were vital to any city's competition for tourists.

Besides the economic reasons to support the arts, we have to realize the arts' impact on our children's education. In a recent survey of public elementary and secondary schools conducted by the Department of Education, teachers and administrators viewed the arts, music, and creative writing as essential to a child's education. If we vote today to approve these cuts to the NEA, the educational and economic impact to our cities would be greater than we could ever imagine.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for the Interior appropriations bill sends a message that we ap-

prove of clearcutting and logging; that we accept rolling back protection for mine workers; and that we feel secure sacrificing Federal support for our Nation's cultural programs. Vote against this bill.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. We did not get it right the first two times. We have made some significant improvements this time.

Once again I want to extend my appreciation to Chairman REGULA, who did truly Herculean work in brokering this compromise. For weeks he engaged in a sort of shuttle diplomacy that would put Henry Kissinger to shame. He has my deepest appreciation.

We have heard a lot about the moratorium on the mining. That is a plus, because that moratorium is in this legislation. And I believe the language on the Tongass National Forest in this bill is a reasonable compromise. Certainly I would prefer that the bill have no Tongass provision at all, but I believe we needed to reach an agreement to move this appropriation forward, and it is a fair compromise.

The compromise removes the sufficiency language that would have insulated alternative P from legal challenges. That is an important victory for the environment.

The compromise removes the prohibition against setting up habitat conservation areas. That is an important victory for the environment.

The compromise removes the constraints on future planting in the Tongass, allowing science to determine the content of future forest management plans. That, too, is an important victory for the environment.

These are all important advances that will protect the forest from excessive logging and permit science to be the basis for future planning.

I want to emphasize that nothing in this bill in any way limits the ability of the Forest Service to make decisions about the future of the Tongass, including reducing the timber acreage or timber sale quantity. Science, that means peer review science conducted in line with standard scientific procedures. Science will determine those figures.

The managers' language makes clear that the Forest Service is empowered to continue with its planning, including filing a final environmental impact statement and record of decision.

The only limitation is that no revisions can be implemented before September 30, 1997. So this is a reasonable compromise.

And my good colleague and friend from Illinois with whom I worked closely on this issue has asked, where have the moderates gone? The moderates have gone into the conference room to sit down with all the players

to work out something that makes sense, that protects the environment and gets us the progress we want. Those who oppose this conference report should consider the alternative, and that alternative is not very friendly to anyone, most likely a continuing resolution with lower funding and more restrictions. We do not want that.

I urge my colleagues to support this conference report, and I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the chairman. He deserves our praise.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the clearest cut, so to speak, examples of corporate welfare that we see padded in our Federal budget.

What we have here is plain and simple, a recognition that while this bill goes about cutting a program to provide low-income people and moderate-income people weatherization funds which are cut by 47 percent, in the same bill we go back in and provide subsidies to the biggest lumber companies in this country, of hundreds of millions of dollars to go in so that they can cut down virgin trees in our most pristine areas of our national forests.

We use Forest Service employees to go in and identify trees, that then the big companies come in cut the trees down, take the trees over to Japan, they mulch them up into fiberboard, we bring them back, buy them in the United States, build our homes with Japanese-supported improvements on our own trees, and then what we do is send the bill to the American taxpayer.

We sit here on the House floor and watch time and time again while the Republican Party stands up and condemns black women on welfare, and yet when it comes to corporate welfare, all of a sudden they lose their tongues.

It is time for this country to come to grips with where the money goes in the Federal budget, whether or not we are willing to stand up to those that have and want more, or whether or not we want to provide a meager opportunity to those that are struggling to put their house in order and to try to be part of the American dream.

I think that this bill demonstrates when we start throwing hundreds of millions of dollars at the Tongass, the Tongass, the most pristine and most beautiful place that I have ever been in the United States of America, and we are extending the amount of land that the Tongass has to be allowed to be cut down by our lumber companies by a third in this bill.

Why would we possibly destroy America's forests and not come to grips with the cost to the American taxpayer?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the full committee.

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding me the time.

I want to say to Chairman REGULA and his subcommittee members and staff that I know it has been a very difficult process finally putting this conference report together. I think the kind of work that has been done by our chairman in connection with making compromises can best be illustrated by pointing to a very serious problems that relates to the work that is being done in the California desert.

As all of your know, the last Congress, we spent many hours on this floor debating the future of the California desert. No small part of that debate centered around the fact that some of us were concerned that the Park Service was being asked to become the new managers of a region that they had very little experience in managing. The Park Service by statute is a single use agency. The desert, however, is unique area that for generations has a long and successful history of multiple use management.

I was very much concerned about the National Park Service's ability to handle these responsibilities. Indeed, we have learned in recent months that they need a good deal more preparation for that management.

Let me share with my colleagues an unfortunate problem that developed recently. The Park Service, in classic form, decided to run their new responsibilities at the Mojave Preserve in a single purpose fashion. In doing so, they essentially excluded many volunteer wildlife organizations that had been very helpful in managing the California desert. The California Department of Fish and Game was excluded as were volunteers from the Society for the Conservation of Bighorn Sheep. These volunteers have worked for years to build a fantastic success story in dealing with the bighorn sheep. Unfortunately, the Park Service excluded them from the Mojave Preserve. As a direct result of Park Service mismanagement, water guzzlers that were voluntarily developed in conjunction with the Bureau of Land Management and the California Department of Fish and Game to help build up our bighorn sheep population malfunctioned. As a result of restricted access by the Park Service, 38 bighorn sheep were killed.

What that really means is our efforts to build that herd up to some 2,000 animals by the year 2000 probably has been undermined because of frankly a lack of experience on managing a multipurpose area.

There is absolutely no doubt that this bill begins to meet that challenge by directing the Park Service to rethink where they have been, come forward with a management plan that will recognize the traditional multiple uses of the Mojave region so that we can save the wildlife success stories that we have had in the eastern Mojave Desert.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, this bill started out terrible and it is slowly getting better. I think maybe the third time is the charm, although I still do not support it because I still believe it is a bad bill that undercuts essential American efforts, it is still environmentally unsound, although incrementally getting better thanks to the efforts of Democrats, being joined by a few moderate Republicans.

However, this bill still savages the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts and still contains language that on its own merit, the Helms language, would not pass even this Congress because it is unconstitutional. But the bill is getting better.

I want to commend both sides for adding funds for Native Americans. Frankly the Democrats embarrassed the Republicans into putting this additional money in here and even though it is not enough, it improves the bill.

I want to take a moment now, however, to mention a matter of great importance to my constituents in Montana and also other Americans. The Senate is going to place in the report, Senate committee report, language which, although it does not have the force of law, is very disturbing. The Senate report language represents an attempt to discourage the efforts of our Secretary of Agriculture to protect the best wild places left in the northern Rocky Mountains in Montana.

Secretary Glickman, a number of weeks ago, announced his intention to issue a directive which will protect the wildest remaining roadless lands in Montana. Those are lands, by the way, which just a year and some ago this House voted overwhelmingly to place in wilderness.

In the last session of Congress, the House voted to place 1.7 million acres of Montana's wildest remaining roadless lands in wilderness. Secretary Glickman is determined, on behalf of President Clinton, to follow the intention of that Congress in which 308 members voted to provide ultimate protection to those wild lands.

Those lands are now under threat. They are under threat from oil and gas leasing, they are under threat from green harvest, most particularly under threat from the salvage sale because of the bill that was supported, sadly, by a majority in this House and Senate.

□ 1500

Those areas are now under threat of being roaded, blasted and gouged. Secretary Glickman has announced his intention to issue an order protecting those areas under his discretion as Secretary of Agriculture until finally both the House and Senate can move, as the House did, alone, in the last Congress.

The Senate report language, in effect, asks the Secretary of Agriculture not to do that, asks that development

go ahead in this the last best place of America.

I simply want the RECORD to show that in the last Congress by a vote of almost 3 to 1. This House voted that those areas receive the ultimate protection of wilderness and I am convinced that this Congress might do no less if it had the opportunity.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, as the old saying goes, three times is a charm.

This is the third time this body is considering the conference report on the fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriation.

And, by golly, this time they have finally got it right, at least, as right as they'll ever get it in terms of maintaining the moratorium on the issuance of mining claim patents.

This version of the conference agreement basically extends the moratorium on the Interior Department issuing mining claim patents that was in place during fiscal year 1995.

In recognition that some patent applications are far enough along the process where the right to a patent may have vested, as with the fiscal year 1995 moratorium, the pending language grandfathers those claims.

While I would prefer to see no patents issued, I cannot quarrel with this grandfather provision as it is aimed at protecting the taxpayer from expensive takings claims.

I also would prefer not to see language in the moratorium requiring an expedited processing of the grandfathered claims. Frankly, the deadline set in the legislation will be impossible for the Department to meet so I do not place a great deal of weight on it.

I am going to support this conference agreement. I am not enthused about the Tongass provision or the Mount Graham telescope language.

I strongly support the designation of Yellowstone National Park as a world heritage site in danger, and note that the conferees simply wrote report language against this proposal. This report language does not carry the weight of law.

And finally, if I had my preference, the appropriations for the Office of Surface Mining and the National Park Service would be a lot different than what is contained in this bill.

However, in light of the fact that the conferees have finally addressed the important issue of mining claim patents in a suitable fashion, and that we must provide funding for the many important programs within the Interior Department, I intend to support this conference agreement although not the bill I would have written, but then rarely is a bill so written.

Mr. Speaker, I do strongly commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the subcommittee chairman, as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], for their years and years of dedicated effort to

try to enact true mining law reform, and absent that we have had to go along with this moratorium as it exists, and as it exists in this particular bill, I will support it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself this time to bring to the attention of the House the letter I have just received from the Executive Office of the President, OMB, dated December 13, 1995, relating to H.R. 1977, the Department of Interior and related agencies appropriations bill, and I quote:

This statement of administration policy provides the administration's views on H.R. 1977, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill, FY 1996, as approved in conference December 12, 1995.

In the November 6, 1995, statement of administration policy to the House, the administration identified the most troublesome provisions in the original conference report with the goal of arriving at a bill that serves specific vital interests and that could be signed by the President.

Regrettably, the third conference report does not adequately address the significant funding shortfalls and objectionable legislative riders. If the bill, as approved by the third conference, were it presented to the President, he would veto it. With few exceptions, the issues that were identified in the November 6 statement of administration policy remain serious problems and are described below.

And there are three pages of objections.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the full statement of administration policy as a part of the RECORD at this point.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE  
PRESIDENT,

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, December 13, 1995.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.)

H.R. 1977—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND  
RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY  
1996

Sponsors: Livingston (R) Louisiana; Regula (R) (Ohio).

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on H.R. 1977, the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 1996, as approved in conference on December 12, 1995. Your consideration of the Administration's views would be appreciated.

In the November 6, 1995, Statement of Administration Policy to the House, the Administration identified the most troublesome provisions in the original conference report with the goal of arriving at a bill that serves specific, vital interests and that could be signed by the President.

Regrettably, the third conference report does not adequately address the significant funding shortfalls and objectionable legislative riders. If the bill, as approved by the third conference, were presented to the President, he would veto it. With few exceptions, the issues that were identified in the November 6th Statement of Administration Policy remain serious problems and are described below.

#### Funding Issues

While the Administration appreciates the \$50 million in funding restored for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service, this additional funding falls short of

the levels needed to maintain these important programs. In addition, the third conference has done nothing to restore funds for the Department of Energy's (DOE's) energy conservation programs.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) budget has been increased in the third conference \$25 million above the previous conference level. That would still leave the program \$111 million short of the House mark and \$159 million below the FY 1995 enacted level. The most significant effect of this action remains the crippling reductions targeted at tribal priority allocation programs, which support essential tribal government, law enforcement, housing improvement, general assistance, Indian child welfare, adult vocational training, road maintenance, and other basic reservation services. The Administration's view is that funding must be restored more substantially for these programs.

DOE's energy conservation programs are still funded at a net level of \$536 million. There has been no increase from the first or second conference levels. This funding level is \$187 million, or 26 percent, below the net FY 1995 enacted level of \$723 million, and 38 percent below the President's request. Funding for these programs must be restored significantly in order to reach acceptable levels.

In addition to the satisfactory resolution of the language issues addressed below, the President will not sign an Interior appropriations bill unless funding for these programs is significantly restored without harming in other high-priority programs or unless there is an overall agreement between the Congress and the Administration on budget priorities that addresses the Administration's fundamental concerns about spending priorities both in this bill and elsewhere.

#### Language Issues

The conference committee has made few changes to the numerous legislative riders in the bill that the Administration finds seriously objectionable. Except for the continuation of the existing mining patent moratorium, the riders that were cited in the November 6th Statement of Administration Policy has not been significantly improved in the third conference. These provisions are so seriously flawed that the Administration sees no way to remedy them, short of removing them altogether. The most serious problems are:

The Tongass (Alaska) forest management provisions. These provisions would dictate the use of the current forest plan for FY 1996 and FY 1997, require unsustainable timber sale levels, and not allow the plan to be updated during this period;

The Interior Columbia River Basin provision. This provision would continue to impede implementation of the comprehensive plan for management of public lands by prohibiting the publication of the final Environmental Impact Statement or Record of Decision and limiting the contents to exclude information on fisheries and watersheds, although it would extend by 90 days the due date for the assessment project. The provision would risk a return to legal gridlock on timber harvesting, grazing, mining, and other economically desirable activities;

Bill language that provides \$500,000 from available funds for the National Park Service (NPS) to develop the Mojave National Preserve's management plan. This provision would still limit funding to \$1 for NPS land management operations within the Preserve, while providing \$599,000 for operational funding to be managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Report language adopted by the third conference calling for more studies by the Park Service, and prohibiting any transfer of funds to NPS to augment op-

erations, does not change the fact that the Preserve would be starved of funding, and the purposes of the California Desert Act would be undercut; and

No change in language from the first conference in a rider to make permanent the protocol for identification of marbled murrelet nests that was included in the FY 1995 rescission bill, thereby eliminating normal flexibility to use new scientific information as it develops.

In addition, the Administration has previously expressed concern about other legislative riders, including the moratorium of future listings and critical habitat designations under the Endangered Species Act, the Department of Energy efficiency standards one-year moratorium, and the provision affecting the Lummi Tribe and seven other self-governance tribes in Washington State.

An additional funding issue concerns the severe cuts (nearly 40 percent) to the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). These significantly reduced funding levels would jeopardize NEA's and NEH's ability to continue to provide important cultural, educational, and artistic programs for communities across America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Interior appropriation bill. Unfortunately, what has occurred here as we have marched through 3 months of off and on floor consideration of this Interior appropriation is that the House has on two occasions, on one occasion by over a 2-to-1 vote, sent this back to conference because of the mining patent problems, has sent it back to conference because of the Tongass language, and not only has the conference not dealt effectively with those issues, they have made some cosmetic changes in terms of them, but the substance and thrust of them, the effect that they would have in terms of the policy initiatives, remains intact, that it is and remains intact in terms of its micromanagement and, of course, according to the mineral rights and patents of the various claims that were filed before 1994. The effect is to make the effect of having a moratorium on mining patents null and void in this insofar as anything that occurred before September 30, 1994. That is probably the ball game. That is the ball game in terms of what is going on.

In the Tongass, the national forest bill modified the language but the levels of timber, 418 million board feet out of the Tongass, is exactly what the language was before. It may be modified in some respects, but it has the same effect.

Worst than that, Mr. Speaker, it seems like this measure has become a moving target, this particular legislation, and I lament that it has become a moving target to attach any legislative matters that the Republican majority thinks that they need to get done, they do not want to have considered or voted on the floor in an up-or-down vote and debated in an open way.

We have maintained log exports from the Northwest, regulations limiting log exports from the Pacific Northwest is set aside. There is authorizing law; a designation of the Vancouver national historic site, an issue that is being and should be considered in the resources authorizing committee. It has changes in the Columbia River Basin assessment. It has new National Park Service authorities. It has managers language in terms of what the park service may do with regard to the protection of Yellowstone, one of the crown jewels of the National Park System in terms of how we can protect the areas around it because there is development in terms of goldmining and that is going to affect the watersheds and this national park. This legislation bars protection or action to monitor.

And so apparently that is of paramount concern to the new majority to protect that degradation of Yellowstone National Park in this legislation.

It talks about wilderness designation and limiting such designation to law. I always thought we legislated wilderness designation. Apparently, at best this measure is the redundant reiteration of the self-evident with regard to what we do with wilderness designation, but I do not know what the language does, or its purpose.

Far more, it goes on to keep all the other riders and limitations preventing the Secretary to exercise his stewardship responsibilities with regard to grazing, preventing the Secretary from trying to attain the recordation of roads and the degradation of the environment.

This bill deserves to be defeated once more today because it has grown worse, not better, in the bad faith effort on the part of the Republican majority party. Today they point to the date and the pressure to enact funding for the departments and agencies in this measure, but the basis for not acting to pass this measure in October or November have not changed. The mining provisions have not changed, the Tongass timber language retains all the limits on the ability to reasonably regulate grazing, road rights of ways and the Endangered Species Act persist in this measure and to add insult to injury the measure piles on new riders and limits—it was not right in September, October, or November and even this crock of December does not justify and warrant passing an appropriation that has grown worst with age not better.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the full committee.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for his incredible patience in working this bill through. This is the third time we have tried to get this through the House, and as the

gentleman who preceded me in the well has vigorously pointed out, some people are never going to be satisfied with this bill. He is not, and there will be others who will vote against it.

But we have massaged this bill under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio. He has worked with the environmentalists. He has worked with the people in the West who are concerned about mining. He has worked with the people in Alaska who are concerned about the Tongass and the environmentalists who are concerned about the same issue on the other side. We have worked with people concerned about the Mohave Desert, and one issue after another, and we have brought them together in the spirit of compromise. That is the legislative process.

The Senate and the House have come together, Republicans and Democrats have come together to agree. Liberals and conservatives, environmentalists and other people who may not consider themselves quite within the environmental mode, all of these people have come together, and today is the day.

The bill did not pass the first time, because one group or another was unhappy. The bill did not pass the second time because other people were unhappy. Today, for crying out loud, let us pass this bill. Send it to the Senate and send it to the President for his signature, yes, for his signature. I know he is threatening a veto, as the gentleman from Illinois has pointed out, but he threatened a veto on the defense bill, too, and he ended up letting that become law.

This is as good a bill as we can get. We have got all the interests competing. We have worked, we have massaged, and we have tried to mold this bill and satisfy everyone's concerns. It is a reasonable bill. It is a good bill. The President of the United States should sign it into law.

I urge the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, earlier the technical 602(b) violation was discussed. I just want to make clear the committee is well within its overall 602 allocation. This particular subcommittee's subdivision however is in technical violation of the so-called 602(b) at this time. The committee has not had an opportunity to revise its latest allocation to shift the necessary funds into the Interior subcommittee. In order to make this new conference report comply with the allocation we will have to shift some \$22 million in budget authority and some \$36 million in outlays. Even with this shift in funds the committee's domestic allocation would still be some \$2.1 billion in budget authority below the ceiling and some \$570 million in outlays below the ceilings.

The committee has always stayed within its overall allocation, and will redirect the funds accordingly.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, Members, my colleagues, this is a good bill. We have addressed your concerns. You have heard the gentleman from New York [Mr.

BOEHLERT] speak and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] who had some differences on the Tongass and on mining, and they both agreed that this represents a reasonable compromise, as was clearly pointed out by the chairman.

I would just point out, also, that in terms of the Tongass, we have reduced the cut from 450 million board feet to 418 and as a practical matter, it will be about 310.

Likewise, we have addressed the mining concerns. The issues that were in the recommittals, I think, have been very thoroughly addressed, and this is quite evident by the fact that the people who have an interest on both sides have spoken in favor of this bill.

Also, I would address the question the President raises in his message about not enough money is being spent. Well, obviously earlier we heard that it was a budget buster. Now, I think that message is a bit in conflict. The truth of the matter is it is a responsible bill, and it does reduce spending, but it uses the funds available in a very prudent way.

As far as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, we have addressed the needs of education, of health. We are actually above the President's request in one of his last statements.

Overall I think that we have a very good bill. I think it is important we get this down to the White House, and I hope that they would sign this so that the 130,000 people that serve all of us in the parks and forests can get on with the job and serve the American people in the way that they would like.

Let me strongly urge the members on both sides to reject the recommittal motion which will be again on the Tongass. We have already, as you have heard from other speakers, we have addressed the problems in the Tongass. Let us reject the recommittal motion and pass the bill.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, once again, I cannot support this Interior appropriations conference agreement. It is a bad deal. Not only are the mining provisions a sham, but once again the bill is a back door attempt to repeal the California Desert Protection Act.

In addition to retaining the \$1 limit on the Park Service budget to manage the Mojave Preserve, this version goes even further by capping their planning money as well. While this third attempt provides a nominal increase to \$500,000 in planning money, it does nothing to restore the protections needed to ensure the park is properly maintained.

When Congress passed the California Desert Protection Act, it placed much of California's desert wilderness under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service. This provided much greater environmental protection than previously afforded under the Bureau of Land Management.

Last year the National Park Service improved visitor services, resource protection, and law enforcement in the Mojave resulting in significantly increased visitation and revenues for the surrounding communities. During the 14 years that the BLM managed the Mojave as a national scenic area, open pit mining,

motorcycle races, and general environmental degradation led to widespread protest.

I understand my good friend and colleague Mr. LEWIS' concern that the Park Service not become overzealous in its oversight of the preserve. However, even the local chamber of commerce has conceded that the new management of the park has enhanced tourism and made the Mojave more enjoyable for everyone. They endorse the changes made by the California Desert Protection Act and oppose the language in this appropriations measure. Not only is the BLM funding level for the preserve inadequate in this measure—a mere \$600,000—but the Park Service's ability to devise a plan to manage the preserve in the future is severely restricted both in dollars and in time. Unless a plan is devised in the next few months, management of the Mojave will in all probability stay in BLM clutches.

I urge my colleagues to once again send the message on this measure that major policy changes affecting the environment—regarding both mining and the Mojave—should be conducted through an open and deliberative legislative process, not shortcut through the appropriations bills. Vote “no” on the Interior appropriations conference report.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the conference report on Interior and related agencies appropriations.

There are a number of reasons to oppose this ill-conceived legislation, and I have discussed some of them in previous debates on this bill. Today, I would like to focus on one shortcoming that is particularly disturbing about the legislation, and that is its failure to provide adequate funding for energy efficiency programs at the Energy Department.

DOE's efficiency programs support the development of new energy efficient technologies that prevent pollution, create jobs, make our economy more competitive, and save consumers precious dollars. Unfortunately, the Republican majority has elected to slash funding for our energy efficiency efforts by 28 percent from the fiscal year 1995 enacted budget.

Of particular concern is the nearly 50 percent cut in low-income weatherization assistance. This program leverages over \$100 million dollars in outside money, enabling low-income Americans to better handle winter and summer energy costs. Because of these debilitating cuts, many thousand fewer homes will become energy efficient this year.

President Clinton has vowed to veto the fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriations bill if and when a conference report clears the Congress. A recent statement of administration policy on the Interior bill stated that, “Funding for [energy efficiency] programs must be restored significantly in order to reach acceptable levels.” I strongly encourage the President to stand firm on his commitment to energy efficiency as a solution which protects the environment and helps the economy.

The President is quite right to criticize this legislation for failing to adequately fund the energy conservation programs within the DOE. The level of funding in H.R. 1977 is inadequate to carry on the important work of these programs.

Many House Members continue to support the President's position on this matter. I urge defeat of the conference report and request that the attached letter to the President, which was signed by 68 House Members, be included in the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, December 6, 1995.

Re H.R. 1977—energy conservation programs

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,  
*The President, The White House*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We want to take this opportunity to strongly endorse the State-ments of Administration Policy of November 7, 1995 and October 19, 1995, in which you indicated that the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1996 (H.R. 1977) should and would be vetoed for a variety of reasons. We share your concern that this legislation does not adequately fund the energy conservation programs within the Department of Energy (DOE).

The funding level for these programs of \$553 million is identical to the first conference report funding level and remains \$215 million (or 28 percent) below fiscal year 1995 appropriations and 38 percent below your budget request.

We believe that this level of funding is inadequate to carry on the important work of these programs. As you know, DOE's energy conservation programs help every American by saving consumers precious dollars, making the economy more efficient and internationally competitive, and improving the environment by preventing pollution. These programs largely work with the private sector to develop and deploy new and more efficient technologies, as well as saving energy on the local level through state energy conservation programs (SECP) and low-income weatherization. We concur with OMB Director Alice Rivlin's statement that “funding for these programs must also be restored significantly to reach acceptable levels.”

The approximately 50 percent reduction in funding for low-income weatherization and SECP is of special concern to us. Many thousand fewer homes will receive economically empowering energy efficiency improvements this winter because of the proposed Congressional cuts.

We applaud your continuing leadership in this area and stand ready to support you in insisting on a strong federal energy efficiency program.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Markey; Sidney R. Yates; Frank Pallone, Jr.; Martin Olav Sabo; Barney Frank; John D. Dingell; Joe Moakley; Vic Fazio; Ronald V. Dellums; John W. Olver; Jerrold Nadler; Patrick J. Kennedy; Lucille Roybal-Al-lard; Bernard Sanders; Dale E. Kildee; Alcee Hastings; Sam Farr; James P. Moran; Earl Hilliard; Maurice Hinchey; Jim McDermott; Robert T. Matsui; Harry Johnston II; James A. Traficant; Carolyn Maloney; Nita M. Lowey; Ike Skelton; Charles E. Schumer; Thomas J. Manton; John Lewis; William Clay; José Serrano; Anthony C. Beilenson; Lane Evans; Gerry E. Studds; Sam Gejdenson; Jack Reed; Nydia Velazquez; Ed Towns; John Conyers; Richard E. Neal; George E. Brown, Jr.; Rosa DeLauro; Ed Pastor; Peter DeFazio; David E. Skaggs; Sherrod Brown; Eliot Engel; Tom Barrett; Bill Richardson; Elizabeth Furse; Sander Levin; Henry Waxman; George Miller; James Oberstar; Ron Wyden; Louis Stokes; Louise Slaughter; Lynn Rivers; Bruce Vento; Earl Pomeroy; Barbara Kennelly; Major Owens; Patricia Schroeder; David R. Obey; Benjamin L. Cardin; David Bonior; Tim Johnson.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report.

There are many reasons to vote against this report, and there are lots of reasons for the

President to veto this bill, which he certainly will in its present form.

Let me focus on just one of the important reasons why Members should vote against the conference report and that is because of the language which will lead to increased federal spending and accelerated logging in the Tongass National Forest.

On November 15, the house voted 230 to 199 to instruct the conferees to drop the Tongass logging rider from this legislation. They haven't done that. What they have done instead is to return to the floor with a cosmetic coverup of more taxpayer subsidies for clearcutting this rainforest.

As one of the architects of the Tongass Timber Reform Act of 1990, I can assure you that this rider is offensive to the goal of that act, which was to modernize forest management. This rider tries to turn the clock back to the days when subsidized clearcutting took priority over all other uses of the forest.

The Tongass rider requires that an outdated, scientifically discredited draft timber plan shall govern management of the National Forest for the next 2 years. What that means is that logging is authorized at a rate of 418 million board feet per year, 100 million board feet over the historic average. Even though the Forest Service already has a solid scientific basis and has rejected this plan as allowing an unsustainable, environmentally destructive rate of harvest, the rider would impose the plan by congressional edict for 2 years.

To add further insult, the rider has sufficiency language which is intended to overturn environmental lawsuits applying to existing sales.

Even at current rates of logging, the Tongass has the Nation's most heavily subsidized timber program. According to GAO, between 1992 and 1994, the cash flow deficit to the Treasury was \$102 million. If we adopt this rider, losses to the Treasury could increase by another \$18 million annually.

And what are we getting for the taxpayer's money? We're taking 400-year-old trees from the rainforest and turning them into pulp. I don't recall that provision being in the Republican Contract With America.

I do recall that during the timber salvage sale debate on the rescissions bill last March, Members were told that the amendment jointly applied to dead, dying, and burnt trees. What has happened is that we got a lot more than we were told about, including cutting of healthy, green old-growth timber in the Northwest.

Don't get fooled again. Vote against this conference report.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. While this bill contains many important elements for natural resource dependent communities, I want to highlight one very important provision that was included in the conference committee yesterday by Senator GORTON.

This provision calls for the National Park Service to extend the lease at Pearson Airpark in the city of Vancouver past the year 2002. This is a key element in my legislation (H.R. 2172) to create the Fort Vancouver National Historic Reserve. While I anticipate that my legislation will pass the House next year, I am supportive of efforts to expedite the process with respect to Pearson Airpark. The designation of the Fort Vancouver National Historic

Reserve will, of course, go through the normal authorizing process.

It was important to expedite the extension of the lease to give the city of Vancouver and the M.J. Murdock trust the certainty they need to forge ahead with the construction of the Murdock Aviation Museum. This will be a Smithsonian quality museum that will highlight the rich aviation history in the city of Vancouver. This legislation will go a long way to making this museum a reality.

I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the conference report on the Department of the Interior Appropriations Act. This appropriations bill contains a moratorium on new listings of endangered or threatened species or new designations of critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act. This moratorium is based on my Farm, Ranch and Homestead Protection Act.

The Endangered Species Act has destroyed the rights of hardworking, taxpaying American families for the sake of blind cave spiders, fairy shrimp, and golden-cheeked warblers. Until Congress reauthorizes the Endangered Species Act to balance the rights of landowners and common sense with environmental concerns, we must protect American landowners by putting regulators on a leash. This amendment would extend the regulatory moratorium on listing of endangered or threatened species or designation of critical habitat until Congress reauthorizes the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, very much. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The clerk read as follows:

Mr. YATES moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 1977 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House position on the amendment of the Senate numbered 108. In order to protect the Tongass National Forest from increased timber harvests.

□ 1515

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 241, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 853]

YEAS—187

Abercrombie	Geren	Obey
Ackerman	Gibbons	Oliver
Andrews	Gonzalez	Ortiz
Baessler	Gordon	Owens
Baldacci	Green	Pallone
Barcia	Gutierrez	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Hall (OH)	Payne (NJ)
Becerra	Hamilton	Payne (VA)
Beilenson	Harman	Pelosi
Bentsen	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (FL)
Berman	Hefner	Pomeroy
Bevill	Hilliard	Poshard
Bishop	Hinche	Rahall
Bonior	Holden	Rangel
Borski	Hoyer	Reed
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Richardson
Browder	Jacobs	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Johnson (SD)	Rose
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Johnston	Rush
Cardin	Kanjorski	Sabo
Chapman	Kaptur	Sanders
Clay	Kennedy (MA)	Sawyer
Clayton	Kennedy (RI)	Schroeder
Clement	Kennelly	Schumer
Clyburn	Kildee	Scott
Coleman	Klecza	Serrano
Collins (IL)	Klink	Sisisky
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Skaggs
Conyers	Lantos	Skelton
Costello	Levin	Slaughter
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
Cramer	Lincoln	Stark
Danner	Lipinski	Stokes
de la Garza	Lofgren	Studds
DeFazio	Lowe	Stupak
DeLauro	Luther	Tanner
Dellums	Maloney	Taylor (MS)
Deutsch	Markey	Thompson
Dicks	Martinez	Thornton
Dingell	Mascara	Thurman
Dixon	Matsui	Tiahrt
Doggett	McCarthy	Torres
Dooley	McDermott	Torricelli
Doyle	McHale	Towns
Durbin	McKinney	Vento
Engel	McNulty	Visclosky
Eshoo	Meehan	Volkmer
Evans	Meek	Walsh
Farr	Menendez	Ward
Fattah	Mfume	Waters
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Watt (NC)
Fields (LA)	Minge	Waxman
Filner	Mink	Williams
Flake	Moakley	Wilson
Foglietta	Mollohan	Wise
Ford	Moran	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Morella	Wyden
Frost	Murtha	Wynn
Furse	Nadler	Yates
Gejdenson	Neal	
Gephardt	Oberstar	

NAYS—241

Allard	Calvert	Dunn
Archer	Camp	Edwards
Armey	Canady	Ehlers
Bachus	Castle	Ehrlich
Baker (CA)	Chabot	Emerson
Baker (LA)	Chambliss	English
Ballenger	Chenoweth	Ensign
Barr	Christensen	Everett
Barrett (NE)	Chrysler	Ewing
Bartlett	Clinger	Fawell
Barton	Coble	Fields (TX)
Bass	Coburn	Flanagan
Bateman	Collins (GA)	Foley
Bereuter	Combest	Forbes
Bilbray	Condit	Fowler
Bilirakis	Cooley	Fox
Bliley	Cox	Franks (CT)
Blute	Crane	Franks (NJ)
Boehlert	Crapo	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	Creameans	Frisa
Bonilla	Cubin	Funderburk
Bono	Cunningham	Gallely
Brewster	Davis	Ganske
Brownback	Deal	Gekas
Bryant (TN)	DeLay	Gilchrest
Bunn	Diaz-Balart	Gillmor
Bunning	Diaz-Balart	Gilman
Burr	Doolittle	Goodlatte
Burton	Dornan	Goodling
Buyer	Dreier	Goss
Callahan	Duncan	Graham

Greenwood	Lucas	Sanford
Gunderson	Manton	Saxton
Gutknecht	Manzullo	Scarborough
Hall (TX)	Martini	Schaefer
Hancock	McCollum	Schiff
Hansen	McCrery	Seastrand
Hastert	McDade	Sensenbrenner
Hastings (WA)	McHugh	Shadegg
Hayes	McIntosh	Shaw
Hayworth	McKeon	Shays
Hefley	Metcalf	Shuster
Heineman	Meyers	Skeen
Herger	Mica	Smith (MI)
Hilleary	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Hobson	Molinar	Smith (TX)
Hoekstra	Montgomery	Smith (WA)
Hoke	Moorhead	Solomon
Horn	Myers	Souder
Hostettler	Myrick	Spence
Houghton	Nethercutt	Stearns
Hunter	Neumann	Stenholm
Hutchinson	Ney	Stockman
Hyde	Norwood	Stump
Inglis	Nussle	Talent
Istook	Orton	Tate
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Tauzin
Johnson, Sam	Packard	Taylor (NC)
Jones	Parker	Tejeda
Kasich	Paxon	Thomas
Kelly	Peterson (MN)	Thornberry
Kim	Petri	Torkildsen
King	Pickett	Traficant
Kingston	Pombo	Upton
Klug	Porter	Vucanovich
Knollenberg	Portman	Walker
Kolbe	Pryce	Wamp
LaHood	Quillen	Watts (OK)
Largent	Quinn	Weldon (FL)
Latham	Radanovich	Weldon (PA)
LaTourette	Ramstad	Weller
Laughlin	Regula	White
Lazio	Riggs	Whitfield
Leach	Roberts	Wicker
Lewis (CA)	Rogers	Wolf
Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)
Lightfoot	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (FL)
Linder	Roth	Zeliff
Livingston	Roukema	Zimmer
LoBiondo	Royce	
Longley	Salmon	

NOT VOTING—4

□ 1535

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. Velázquez for, with Mr. McInnis against.

Mr. PACKARD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay".

Ms. WATERS and Messrs. FARR, BERMAN, CHAPMAN, and PETERSON of Florida, changed their vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 181, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 854]

YEAS—244

Allard	Bartlett	Blute
Archer	Barton	Boehlert
Armey	Bass	Boehner
Bachus	Bateman	Bonilla
Baker (CA)	Bereuter	Bono
Baker (LA)	Bilbray	Brewster
Ballenger	Bilirakis	Brownback
Barr	Bishop	Bryant (TN)
Barrett (NE)	Bliley	Bunn

Bunning	Hastings (WA)	Paxon	Hilliard	Meek	Schroeder
Burr	Hayes	Pickett	Hinchey	Menendez	Schumer
Burton	Hefley	Pombo	Holden	Mfume	Scott
Buyer	Heineman	Porter	Hostettler	Miller (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Calvert	Herger	Portman	Hoyer	Minge	Serrano
Camp	Hilleary	Pryce	Jackson-Lee	Mink	Skaggs
Canady	Hobson	Quillen	Jacobs	Moakley	Skelton
Castle	Hoekstra	Quinn	Jefferson	Moran	Slaughter
Chabot	Hoke	Radanovich	Johnson (SD)	Morella	Spratt
Chambliss	Horn	Rahall	Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Stark
Christensen	Houghton	Ramstad	Johnston	Neumann	Stokes
Chrysler	Hunter	Reed	Kanjorski	Oberstar	Studds
Clinger	Hutchinson	Regula	Kaptur	Obey	Stupak
Coble	Hyde	Riggs	Kennedy (MA)	Olver	Taylor (MS)
Coburn	Inglis	Roberts	Kennedy (RI)	Ortiz	Tejeda
Collins (GA)	Istook	Rogers	Kennelly	Owens	Thompson
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher	Kildee	Pallone	Thornton
Cooley	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen	Klecza	Pastor	Thurman
Cox	Jones	Roukema	Klink	Payne (NJ)	Tiahrt
Crane	Kasich	Royce	LaFalce	Payne (VA)	Torres
Crapo	Kelly	Salmon	Lantos	Pelosi	Torricelli
Cremeans	Kim	Sanford	Levin	Peterson (FL)	Towns
Cunningham	King	Saxton	Lewis (GA)	Peterson (MN)	Vento
Danner	Kingston	Scarborough	Lipinski	Petri	Visclosky
Davis	Klug	Schaefer	Lofgren	Pomeroy	Volkmer
Deal	Knollenberg	Schiff	Lowey	Poshard	Ward
DeLay	Kolbe	Seastrand	Luther	Rangel	Waters
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Shadegg	Maloney	Richardson	Watt (NC)
Dickey	Largent	Shaw	Manton	Rivers	Waxman
Dicks	Latham	Shays	Markley	Roemer	Williams
Doolittle	LaTourette	Shuster	Martinez	Rose	Wilson
Dornan	Laughlin	Sisisky	Matsui	Roth	Woolsey
Doyle	Lazio	Skeen	McCarthy	Roybal-Allard	Wyden
Dreier	Leach	Smith (MI)	McDermott	Rush	Wynn
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)	McHale	Sabo	Yates
Dunn	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)	McKinney	Sanders	
Edwards	Lightfoot	Smith (WA)	Meehan	Sawyer	
Ehlers	Lincoln	Solomon			
Ehrlich	Linder	Souder			
Emerson	Livingston	Spence	Callahan	McInnis	Waldholtz
English	LoBiondo	Stearns	Chenoweth	Tucker	
Ensign	Longley	Stenholm	Hancock	Velazquez	
Everett	Lucas	Stockman			
Ewing	Manzullo	Stump			
Fawell	Martini	Talent			
Fields (TX)	Mascara	Tanner			
Flanagan	McColum	Tate			
Foley	McCrery	Tauzin			
Forbes	McDade	Taylor (NC)			
Fowler	McHugh	Thomas			
Fox	McIntosh	Thornberry			
Franks (CT)	McKeon	Torkildsen			
Franks (NJ)	McNulty	Trafficant			
Frelinghuysen	Metcalf	Upton			
Frisa	Meyers	Vucanovich			
Funderburk	Mica	Walker			
Ganske	Miller (FL)	Walsh			
Gekas	Molinar	Wamp			
Geren	Mollohan	Watts (OK)			
Gilchrest	Montgomery	Weldon (FL)			
Gillmor	Moorhead	Weldon (PA)			
Gilman	Murtha	Weller			
Goodlatte	Myers	White			
Goodling	Myrick	Whitfield			
Gordon	Neal	Wicker			
Goss	Nethercutt	Wise			
Graham	Ney	Wolf			
Greenwood	Norwood	Young (AK)			
Gunderson	Nussle	Young (FL)			
Gutknecht	Orton	Zeliff			
Hall (TX)	Oxley	Zimmer			
Hansen	Packard				
Hastert	Parker				

## NAYS—181

Abercrombie	Clement	Farr
Ackerman	Clyburn	Fattah
Andrews	Coleman	Fazio
Baesler	Collins (IL)	Fields (LA)
Baldacci	Collins (MI)	Filner
Barcia	Condit	Flake
Barrett (WI)	Conyers	Foglietta
Becerra	Costello	Ford
Beilenson	Coyne	Frank (MA)
Bentsen	Cramer	Frost
Berman	Cubin	Furse
Bevill	de la Garza	Gallegly
Bonior	DeFazio	Gedenson
Borski	DeLauro	Gephardt
Boucher	Dellums	Gibbons
Browder	Deutsch	Gonzalez
Brown (CA)	Dingell	Green
Brown (FL)	Dixon	Gutierrez
Brown (OH)	Doggett	Hall (OH)
Bryant (TX)	Dooley	Hamilton
Cardin	Durbin	Harman
Chapman	Engel	Hastings (FL)
Clay	Eshoo	Hayworth
Clayton	Evans	Hefner

execute in the Hyde-Barr amendment as a new base text for H.R. 1710.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

#### FURTHER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1530, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. SPENCE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1530) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes:

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-405) on the resolution (H. Res. 304) providing for debate and for consideration of three measures relating to the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO UNITED STATES TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 304, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 304

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to debate the deployment of United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2770) to prohibit Federal funds from being used for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peace-keeping operation, or as part of any implementation force. The bill shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Dornan of California and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1553

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McInnis for, with Ms. Velázquez against.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT ON AMENDMENTS TO THE COMPREHENSIVE ANTITERRORISM ACT

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee may be meeting as soon as this Saturday, December 16, to grant a rule which may limit the amendments to be offered to H.R. 1710, the Comprehensive Antiterrorism Act of 1995.

Subject to the approval of the Rules Committee, this rule may include a provision limiting amendments to those specified in the rule. Any Member who desires to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by 4 p.m. on Friday, December 15, to the Rules Committee, at room H-312 in the Capitol.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the Hyde-Barr substitute, which has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 5, and which has also been introduced as a separate bill (H.R. 2703). The rule is likely to self-